REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-7 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the Yamazaki, et al. (US 6,400,466) patent. With respect to applicant's claims, as amended, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 5-7 have been amended to better define applicant's invention. More particularly, applicant's amended independent claim 1 now recites a data processing apparatus for effecting a predetermined process with respect to another data processing apparatus including a recognition unit for recognizing a money account function of another data processing apparatus, a decision unit for deciding that said data processing apparatus is to effect a money account process for a first process by said data processing apparatus and for a second process by said another data processing apparatus, in the case where said recognition unit recognizes that said another data processing apparatus does not have the money account function, and a control unit for controlling execution of the money account process in accordance with the decision by said decision unit. Applicant's independent method 6 claim has been similarly amended.

Applicant's amended independent claim 5 recites a data processing apparatus including a processing portion for effecting a predetermined process with respect to another data processing apparatus, an information portion for informing said another data processing apparatus that the data processing apparatus has the money account function, so that said another data processing apparatus does not execute the money account process for the predetermined process, and a money account portion for executing the money account process for a first process by said data processing apparatus and for a second process by said another

25813/158/732692.1

data processing apparatus in order to execute the predetermined process after the informing by said information portion. Method claim 7 has been similarly amended.

Such constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record. More particularly, the Yamazaki, et al. patent discloses a copying system having a scanner and printer which are directly connected. The system includes a printer controller controlling a print engine based on data received from an external computer via a network line, an interface switching unit switching the occupancy of the printer engine between the printer controller and the scanner, and a controller that makes the printer controller occupy the printer engine by means of controlling the interface switching unit when a trouble occurs while the printer engine is occupied by the scanner.

The Examiner has argued that the aforesaid system can be equated to applicant's claimed invention and, in particular, cites the following figures and passages of the patent: FIGS. 1 and 2, column 11, lines 4-45; column 2, line 40, through column 3, line 17. The Examiner specifically points to column 11, lines 10-37, of the patent as teaching recognizing the other data processing apparatus does not have an account function. These lines describe, as mentioned above, what occurs when the printer has trouble when the scanner is occupying the printer engine and how the print controller is able to be made aware of the trouble.

While applicant does not agree with the application of the system of the Yamazaki, et al. patent to applicant's claimed invention, applicant has nonetheless amended applicant's claims to recite that the account function is a money account function. It is evident that the Yamazaki, et al. patent and, in particular, the above figures and passages of the patent, do not deal with a money account function of the components described.

- 6 -

25813/158/732692.1

Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in the patent of ". . .recognizing a money account function of another data processing apparatus . . . deciding that said data processing apparatus is to effect a money account process for a first process by said data processing apparatus and for a second process by said another data processing apparatus, in the case where said . . . said another data processing apparatus does not have the money account function, and . . . controlling execution of the money account process in accordance with the decision . . . .", as required by applicant's amended claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims. Nor is there any teaching or suggestion in the patent of " . . . effecting a predetermined process with respect to another data processing apparatus . . . informing said another data processing apparatus that the data processing apparatus has the money account function, so that said another data processing apparatus does not execute the money account process for the predetermined process, and . . . executing the money account process for a first process by said data processing apparatus and for a second process by said another data processing apparatus in order to execute the predetermined process after the informing . . . .", as required by applicant's amended claims 5 and 7, and their respective dependent claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: January 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
T(212) 790-9200

John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,159
Attorney for Applicant